

*REMARKS**Discussion of Specification and Claim Amendments*

The specification has been amended to correct an obvious typographical error. Thus, paragraphs [00105] and [00106] have been amended to identify that compound 25 has a 6-amino group rather than a 6-methylamino group (on purinyl), as supported by Table 3 at page 44. In addition, the synthetic procedure set forth in paragraph [00106] should lead to the 6-amino compound. Further, it is clear that the 6-amino compound was intended at lines 4-5 of paragraph [0018]; otherwise, the second 6-methylamino compound would be a duplicate.

The claims have been amended to expedite the prosecution of the application. New claims 52-57 have been added and are directed to embodiments of the invention. The amended and new claims are supported by the original claims and the specification.

No new matter has been added.

The Office Action

The Office Action sets forth the following grounds for rejection:

1. Claims 6, 8, and 22-24 are rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, for an alleged indefiniteness;
2. Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 8, 10, 19-20, 22, 26-28, 30, and 46-48 are rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, for an alleged lack of written description; and
3. Claims 26-31, 45, and 48 are rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, for an alleged non-enablement.

Claims 43, 44, and 49-51 have been allowed.

Claims 5, 7, 9, 21, 23, and 25 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but are indicated allowable if re-written in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Examiner Interview

The reply to the previous Office Action included a summary of the substance of the interview. Accordingly, the requirement for providing a summary of the substance of the interview has been fulfilled.

Discussion of Rejections

1. Although applicants disagree with the indefiniteness rejection, the issue is now moot since the claims 6, 8, 22, and 24 have been canceled without prejudice.

2. In regard to the written description rejection of claims 1, 3-4, 6, 8, 10, 19-20, 22, 26-28, 30, and 46-48, the issue has been rendered moot in view of the cancellation without prejudice of these claims.

3. Claims 26-31, 45, and 48 are rejected as allegedly non-enabled. Applicants respectfully disagree. Nevertheless, claims 26-28, 30, 45, and 48 have been canceled without prejudice to expedite the prosecution of the application.

As regards claims 29 and 31, applicants respectfully submit that these claims are fully enabled. Claim 29 is dependent upon claim 5, which the Office Action has indicated to be allowable if rewritten as independent claim. Applicants have rewritten claim 5 as an independent claim. Claim 29 has been amended to recite a method of antagonizing an A₃ adenosine receptor antagonist. Applicants have provided test results showing that compound 12 (the compound of claims 5 and 29) in Table 4 has high K_i value for human A₃ adenosine receptor, indicating excellent antagonist activity (see also paragraph [00133] at page 45). Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claim 29 is fully enabled, and therefore, should be allowed.

As regards claim 31, this claim refers to the compound of claim 7, which is directed to A₃ adenosine receptor agonists. Claim 31 is now directed to a method of agonizing an A₃ adenosine receptor agonist in an animal. As set forth in Table 4, compounds 20, 23, 29, 33, and 36 covered by claim 31 are A₃ adenosine receptor agonists. Accordingly, claim 31 is fully enabled, and therefore, should be allowed.

New claims 52-57 also should not be rejected on this basis. These claims involve compound 25, which is shown in Table 5 and paragraph [00133] to be an A₃ adenosine receptor antagonist.

The Office Action states in lines 6-5 of page 3: "Applicants present testing on one species, compound 33 (LJ-529), showing it effective in two xenograft models of breast...". Applicants note that there is an error in the Office Action. As set forth in the previous Reply, page 9 (see Discussion of Rejection under 112, First Paragraph) and in the specification paragraph [00127], LJ-529 corresponds to compound 36 and not compound 33.

In view of all of the foregoing, the non-enablement rejection should be withdrawn.

Foreign Priority

The Office indicates that the copy of the priority document KR 2002/0065441 that applicants submitted has been misplaced. Applicants now enclose a second certified copy of the priority document. Applicants respectfully request that the Office acknowledge the receipt of the priority document in the next Office Action or Notice of Allowance.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the patent application is in condition for allowance or in better condition for consideration on appeal. The Examiner is requested to enter the amendments. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Xavier Pillai, Reg. No. 39,799
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900
180 North Stetson Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6780
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: August 7, 2006